

CANADA in relation to
the Unity of the Empire
by
Sir Charles Tupper

85/4 Colonial Inst.
1894



3 9004 03454340 2

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE
COLLECTION of CANADIANA



Queen's University at Kingston



*Purchased for the Lorne Pierce Collection
at Queen's University on the
Edith Chown Pierce Trust*

honourable, manly, and courageous in the development of Australia. I am inclined to agree that the single tax is impracticable; at the same time, if taxation has to be resorted to, the land is a fair source from which we ought to get a portion of it at least, especially as the State expenditure has done so much in many cases to increase its value. In regard to my ultra-British friend Mr. Beetham, he says let us "emulate the Old Country, and not eclipse her." Well, I have an ambition to be even a better man than my father. I say let us emulate the Old Country in everything that is good—let us eclipse her, if possible, in *all* that is good, and let us hope she will not be ashamed to take a hint from her children at any time, when they are going in the path of everything that is truly noble and wisely progressive. I thank you for the reception you have given me to-night. I am exceedingly pleased to have had the opportunity of seeing so many who evidently take a deep interest in the welfare and prosperity of our Colonies. I have tried to strike a high key note, and I shall be sorry if I have failed. My object was not to speak of any one Colony or any one interest in particular, but to impress on your imaginations the enormous development which is taking place in profitable industry all over the Colonies. In conclusion, I wish to move a hearty vote of thanks to our Chairman, the oldest Agent-General of the Colonies at the present time, and one who has borne the heat and burden of the day in all sorts of worthy enterprise, not only material, but intellectual, moral, and political. The name of Sir Saul Samuel is one that not only stands high in the respect, but lies deep in the affections, of all those who know what has been the progress of the Colonies within the last 30 or 40 years; and I ask you, therefore, to give him a hearty vote of thanks, encouraging him in his noble work, and showing we honour and respect him for the good qualities of heart and brain which have made his name such an honoured name amongst us.

The CHAIRMAN having replied, the Meeting terminated.

SEVENTH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

THE Seventh Ordinary General Meeting of the Session was held at the Whitehall Rooms, Hôtel Métropole, on Tuesday, May 8, 1894, when Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., G.C.M.G., C.B., read a Paper on "Canada in Relation to the Unity of the Empire."

The Right Hon. the Marquis of Lorne, K.T., G.C.M.G., a Vice-President of the Institute, presided.

The Minutes of the last Ordinary General Meeting were read and confirmed, and it was announced that since that Meeting 23 Fellows had been elected, viz., 7 Resident and 16 Non-Resident.

Resident Fellows:—

Richard O. Backhouse, Frederick Carter, Alexander Douglas, Frederick William Fry, George Stanley Harris, Lawrence A. Wallace, A.M.Inst.C.E., George Wood.

Non-Resident Fellows:—

Alexander Carrick (New Zealand), Alcide Des Mazures, Rev. R. Gresley Douglas, M.A. (Cape Colony), Joseph R. Dyer (Transvaal), Harry M. Elliott (Transvaal), Major Patrick W. Forbes (Matabeleland), William John Garnett (Victoria), Dr. Henry E. Garrett (New South Wales), William Ingall, M.C.P. (British Guiana), Hon. C. J. Johnston, M.L.C. (New Zealand), James Malcolm (New South Wales), Capt. R. G. Murray (R.M.S. "Himalaya"), Dr. Walter F. Oakeshott (Transvaal), George F. Perrins (Transvaal), Edward Shields (Cape Colony), Edmund T. Somerset (Transvaal).

It was also announced that donations to the Library of books, maps, &c., had been received from the various Governments of the Colonies and India, Societies, and public bodies both in the United Kingdom and the Colonies, and from Fellows of the Institute and others.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comparisons are odious, and you will not think I am comparing one Colony with another if I venture to say that in one respect Canada is most remarkable—namely, in the steadfastness with which she allows Ministries to remain in office; for it may be in your recollection, when you consider the politics of States on the continent of Europe and elsewhere, that in some, at all events, of those States, Ministries are changed almost with the changing of the moon. As against that—as I cannot help thinking—evil example we see, if we turn to Canada, that for five years since

Confederation one party was in office, and with the exception of those five years another party has been constantly in power by the suffrages of the Canadian people. We shall have the great happiness to-night of hearing a Paper from one of the fathers of the Canadian Confederation, who has had the good fortune to be of the party which has been so constantly and steadfastly in office ever since the formation of that great Dominion; and as we know that the Confederation has had an almost unexampled success amongst the federal systems of the world, Sir Charles Tupper, in speaking of Canadian wishes and aspirations and the conditions of the country, will be able to tell you, with the utmost authority, what those desires are, he himself knowing well their very spring and sources.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER then read his Paper on

CANADA IN RELATION TO THE UNITY OF THE EMPIRE.

THE most important event of recent years conducive to the unity of the British Empire was, in my opinion, the Confederation of Canada. Down to that period British North America was composed of five isolated provinces, and the great Rupert's Land was a howling wilderness, occupied by 25,000 savages, and the home of the buffalo. The provinces were separated by hostile tariffs, with no common interests and no means of intercommunication by railway. The Great North-West, declared by Lord Dufferin to be capable of providing happy homes for 40 millions of people, was separated from the older provinces by a thousand miles of wilderness, and by the Rocky Mountains from the Province of British Columbia. All this has been changed. These isolated provinces, separated from the Republic to the south by an invisible line of from 3,000 to 4,000 miles in extent, have been united under one strong Federal Government, and bound together by a great transcontinental railway from Halifax on the Atlantic Ocean to Vancouver on the Pacific.

Another important event conducing to the unity of the Empire is about to take place. A Conference is to be held at Ottawa, on June 21 next, which will be attended by representatives of the Governments of Australia and New Zealand, and of the Imperial Government, and possibly of the South African Governments, for the purpose of considering the best means of drawing these great outlying possessions of the Crown into closer trade relations with each other and with Great Britain. A deputation of the representatives of Australasia, South Africa, and Canada recently had the

honour of an interview with the Earl of Rosebery and the Marquis of Ripon on this subject. They stated that Canada had agreed to give a subsidy of £175,000 a year to a fast steamship service between England and Australasia *via* Canada, and would give substantial support to a cable from Vancouver to Australia, and that these subsidies would be largely supplemented by the Governments of Australasia; and they asked for the co-operation and aid of her Majesty's Government to these services, on the ground of their great political, strategical, commercial, and defensive value.

The deputation was assured that their representations would receive the most careful consideration of the Government, and that a representative would be sent to attend the Conference at Ottawa. This movement has received, as might naturally be expected, the hearty support of a large portion of the Press of this country.

Many persons have been surprised to find that Sir John Colomb, who has professed to be a friend of the unity of the Empire, has assumed a position of hostility to these proposals. I confess that I did not share that surprise, as I had long since learned that that gentleman was apparently not well-informed of the extent to which the great Colonies have rendered yeoman service to the defence of the Empire—unless, as Sir John Colomb seems to think, the term Empire applies only to Great Britain. As this is a question of much moment, permit me to draw attention briefly to some of these services.

A few years ago every important town in British North America was garrisoned by British troops. To-day not one of them is to be found in that country, except at Halifax, where a small force is kept for strategical purposes.

When Canada purchased the North-West Territory from the Hudson Bay Company, Lord Wolseley was sent with Imperial troops to put down a rebellion. When a subsequent rising, under the same half-breed leader, Riel, took place, it was suppressed by Canada without the cost of a shilling to Great Britain.

The Government of Canada has expended on—

An Interoceanic Railway	\$ 120,000,000
Canals	60,000,000
Deepening the St. Lawrence	3,384,000
Graving Docks.	2,700,000
North-West and Lands	7,000,000
Indians (20 years)	13,500,000
North-West Rebellion	7,000,000
British Columbia Fortifications	256,000
	<u>213,840,000</u>

and expends annually on—

Militia	\$ 1,340,000
Mounted Police	625,000
British Columbia Garrison	47,500
Eight steamers coast service	172,000
Subsidy China and Austral. steam service	200,000
Subsidy pledged to Atlantic steam service	750,000
Interest at 4 per cent. on \$213,840,000	8,553,600
	<u>11,688,100</u>

Or about £2,337,620 per annum.

This is irrespective of the annual cost of maintenance of 741 light-houses, \$450,000; immigration expenses, \$200,000; and expenditure connected with Indians, \$959,864.

This expenditure secured the construction of a great transcontinental line of railway, bringing England twenty days nearer to Japan than by the Suez Canal. It has provided an alternative line to India, upon which Great Britain may have to depend for the security of her possessions in the East. It enables her ships of war to reach Montreal, and her gunboats to go to the heart of the continent at the head waters of Lake Superior. It provides graving docks at Halifax, Quebec, and Victoria; extinguishes the title of the Indians, and provides for their civilisation at a cost of nearly a million dollars a year; opens to British settlement the great North-West, where every eligible immigrant is entitled to a free grant of 160 acres of land; maintains a permanent defensive force, and trains 38,000 volunteers, and provides a garrison for the fortifications of British Columbia. Included in this are the subsidies for the Atlantic and Pacific steamers, available for the use anywhere of her Majesty's Government as war cruisers and transports at a moment's notice. Canada also supports a Royal Military College at Kingston, seventy or eighty of whose cadets are now officers in the British Army.

Before confederation the fisheries of the British Provinces were protected by her Majesty's navy. Now that service is performed by eight armed steamers owned and maintained by Canada. This expenditure of £2,337,620 per annum is cheerfully borne by the people of Canada for services vital to the strength, defence, and unity of the Empire. Yet, at a meeting at the London Working Men's College, on March 11, 1893, Sir John Colomb said: "England paid 19s. 6d. out of every pound of the cost of defending the Empire, Australia $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and Canada not a brass farthing!"¹ I may say that

¹ The above is quoted from *Imperial Federation*, but Sir John Colomb informs me that the words he used were not as stated above, but as follows:

in addition to the large capital expenditure made by Australasia and South Africa for naval and harbour defensive purposes, I find the annual expenditure for naval and military defence in those Colonies at the last dates available to be as follows:—

Colony	Year	Amount £
New South Wales	1892	368,227
Victoria	1892-3	193,651 ¹
Queensland	1893-4	56,499 ¹
South Australia	1893-4	40,068 ¹
Tasmania	1892	19,282
Western Australia	1893	12,699
New Zealand	1892-3	87,865
Cape of Good Hope	1891-2	275,096 ²
Natal	1893-4	60,384 ³
Total		<u>1,113,771</u>

¹ Estimated Expenditure.

² Including £124,415 expended on Cape Police available for defence.

³ Including £34,366 expended on Natal Mounted Police.

Then, again, Sir John Colomb in his address to Mr. Gladstone on April 13, 1893, said: "The United Kingdom bears the whole burthen of the Diplomatic and Consular Services." He ought to have known that, independent of the Governors, whose salaries are paid by the autonomous Colonies, Canada paid one-half the cost of the survey of the international boundary between the United States and Canada from the Lake of the Woods to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, over £68,000; the whole of the cost of the Halifax Arbitration between Great Britain and the United States, arising out of the Washington Treaty of 1871; half the expenditure connected with the Treaty of Washington of 1888, to determine the construction of the Treaty of 1818 between Great Britain and the United States; and that Canada is now engaged in settling the Alaskan boundary at her own expense, and pays one-half of the expenses, some £20,000, of the Arbitration at Paris of 1893, when the question at issue between Great Britain and the United States was described by Sir Charles Russell to be—

The principle of freedom of the seas; the principle that upon the sea ships of all nations are equal, whether it is a ship of a great or insignificant Power; the principle that upon the high seas ships are part of the territory of the nation; the principle that upon the high seas subjects of every nation can take at their will, according to their ability, of the products of the sea.

"The United Kingdom paid 19s. 6d. out of every pound spent on the naval protection of the Empire, Australia $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and Canada not a brass farthing."

It is interesting to turn from views of this kind to those held by the statesmen of both the great parties in this country. About two years ago Lord Salisbury thus expressed his opinion of the importance of the outlying portions of the Empire :—

What is it that gives to this little island its commanding position ? It is the fact that every nation from every quarter of the globe can enter your ports with the products of countless regions, and supply your industries and manufactures, so that those industries and manufactures may compete with every corner of the globe. And why should you occupy this privileged position ? Because your flag floats over regions far wider than any other, and because upon the dominion of your Sovereign the sun never sets.

Mr. Gladstone, in terms equally emphatic, in the House of Commons last year paid the following tribute to the Colonies :—

An absolute revolution has taken place in the entire system of governing the vast dependencies of this Empire, and the consequence is that, instead of being, as before, a source of grievance and discredit, they had become one of the chief glories of Great Britain and one of the main sources of our moral strength.

The vital importance to England of her Colonial trade was forcibly illustrated in a speech at Leeds a few years ago by the Earl of Rosebery, whose views upon the subject of the unity of the Empire are too well known to need repetition. Who that is interested in this great question can doubt the wisdom of the following utterance of the Marquis of Salisbury in 1892 ?—

We know that every bit of the world's surface which is not under the British flag is a country which may be, and probably will be, closed to us by a hostile tariff, and therefore it is that we are anxious above all things to conserve, to unify, to strengthen the Empire of the Queen, because it is to the trade that is carried on within the Empire of the Queen that we look for the vital force of the commerce of this country.

The maxim "that trade follows the flag" is proved beyond question by the Trade Returns, which show that the self-governing Colonies and West Indies take of British exports £2 18s. 9d. per head, as against 8s. 5d. per head of the population of the United States, or seven times as much.

Six of the Colonies importing the largest quantity of British produce—the Cape, Canada, New South Wales, Victoria, New Zealand, and Queensland—took in 1891 £3 11s. 10d. per head, as against 5s. 9d. per head of the populations of the United States,

Germany, France, Spain, Brazil, and Russia together, or a little over twelve times as much.

In 1892 the same Colonies took British goods to the extent of £3 1s. 5d. per capita, as against 5s. 5d. in the foreign countries already mentioned, or a little over eleven times as much.

Exports to Self-governing Colonies and to the West Indies, 1892.

Colony	£	Population
Canada	6,869,808	4,833,000
Newfoundland	558,674	197,000
West Australia	524,249	50,000
South Australia	1,717,492	315,000
Victoria	4,726,361	1,140,000
New South Wales	6,566,352	1,134,000
Queensland	1,793,391	394,000
Tasmania	477,790	147,000
New Zealand	3,450,537	627,000
Cape and Natal	7,929,484	{ 1,527,000 544,000
West Indies and British Guiana	2,936,624	1,860,000
Totals	<u>37,550,762</u> ¹	<u>12,768,000</u>

¹ Or £2 18s. 9d. per head.

Exports to United States, £26,547,234 ; population, 62,622,000 ; or 8s. 5d. per head.

Exports to certain Colonies, 1891 and 1892.

Colony	1892 £	1891 £	Population
Cape	7,929,484	7,957,878	2,071,000
Canada	6,869,808	6,820,990	4,833,000
New South Wales	6,566,352	8,999,969	1,134,000
Victoria	4,726,361	7,249,224	1,140,000
New Zealand	3,450,537	3,369,177	627,000
Queensland	1,793,391	2,224,316	394,000
Totals	<u>31,335,933</u> ¹	<u>36,621,554</u> ²	<u>10,199,000</u>

¹ Equal to £3 1s. 5d. per head.

² Equal to £3 11s. 10d. per head.

Exports to certain Foreign Countries.

	1891 £	Population
United States	27,544,553	62,622,000
Germany	18,804,329	49,428,000
France	16,429,665	38,343,000
Spain	4,977,473	17,550,000
Brazil	8,290,039	14,002,000
Russia	5,407,402	97,506,000
Totals	<u>81,453,461</u> ¹	<u>279,451,000</u>

¹ Equal to 5s. 9d. per head.

	1892 £	Population
United States	26,547,234	62,622,000
Germany	17,583,412	49,428,000
France	14,686,894	38,343,000
Spain	4,672,938	17,550,000
Brazil	7,910,326	14,002,000
Russia	5,357,081	97,506,900
Totals	<u>76,757,885</u> ¹	<u>279,451,000</u>

¹ Equal to 5s. 5d. per head.

Who, with such evidence before them, can question from an Imperial standpoint the importance of developing the commerce between the Colonies and between them and the Mother Country?

All the self-governing Colonies have united in asking her Majesty's Government to take measures to so modify the treaties with Belgium and Germany as to enable closer trade arrangements to be made between the United Kingdom and her Colonies than with foreign countries. All these Colonies equally desire and have requested the Government to submit to Parliament an amendment of the Imperial Act of 1873, 36 Vic. cap. 22, to enable the Colonies of Australasia to make the same trade arrangements with Canada and South Africa as under that Act any of the Australian Colonies can now make with each other and with New Zealand. This proposal embodies no new principle, but simply extends the power already conferred by the Act in question; and considering the Imperial importance of drawing the great Colonies into more intimate commercial relations with each other as well as with England, we may confidently anticipate the hearty support of her Majesty's Government and Parliament. The Parliament of Canada some time since passed a resolution pledging itself to give preferential tariff concessions to this country when the products of the Colonies are admitted into Great Britain on more favourable terms than are accorded to foreign countries. In the same spirit, now that the financial position of Canada enables the Government to reduce taxation, they have adopted a tariff during the present session which effects reductions in the duties upon many of the staple exports of England.

To pass on to another branch of the subject, it may be well for me to state what is, as I understand it, in the minds of the promoters of the Anglo-Canadian-Australian steamship service, in respect to the steamship connection between Great Britain and Australasia by way of Canada.

At the outset it is interesting to know the average time occupied

in the conveyance of mails to and from Sydney and London by the present Suez route. The latest Blue-book that I have been able to obtain is that of the Report of the Postmaster-General of New South Wales for the year 1892, issued in 1893. There I find that the returns of the mail service of the Orient Steamship Navigation Company during the year 1892 give the average time between London and Sydney as 33 11-13 days, and between Sydney and London as 33 11-26 days; while in the case of the Peninsular and Oriental Navigation Company during the year 1892 the average time occupied in the conveyance of mails to and from Sydney and London was as follows: London to Sydney, 33 19-26 days; Sydney to London, 34 6-13 days.

The consideration paid by the British and Australasian Governments for the above mail service is £85,000 per annum to each Company, or £170,000 together; and out of this contribution of £170,000 the United Kingdom pays £95,000.

The present intention of the proposed Steamship Company is to have upon the Atlantic a weekly service of 20 knots speed all the year round, and to maintain it by the building of four exceptionally large, swift, completely equipped express passenger steamships.

On the Pacific, at present, it is only proposed to have three steamships, thus adding one steamship to those now performing the monthly service between Sydney and Vancouver. The presence of a third steamship on the Pacific has enabled the promoters of the new service to suggest two propositions:—

1. That there shall be during the summer months a three-weekly service between Sydney, Moreton Bay, Fiji, Honolulu, Victoria, and Vancouver, and during the winter season a four-weekly service by the same route. It may be said at the outset that the mails by that route can be easily delivered in the time now occupied by the Suez route; but it will be observed that it is only, in the one case, a three-weekly service, and in the other a four-weekly service.

2. If it shall be hereafter decided to call at a New Zealand port in preference to Moreton Bay, Queensland, then, with three steamships on the Pacific, the service can easily and regularly, all the year round, maintain the four-weekly service between Sydney, Auckland, Fiji, Honolulu, Victoria, and Vancouver.

The drawback to calling at a New Zealand port instead of a Queensland port would be the lengthening of the voyage between the last Australian port of call (*i.e.* of Sydney) and England by 36 hours each way; but even allowing an additional 36 hours for

the extra mileage by the New Zealand route, the promoters of the service state that they would be able to deliver the Sydney mails, from the date of the establishment of the fast Atlantic service, in about the same time that is *now* occupied by the steamships of the Peninsular and Oriental and Orient Companies from Sydney to London by the Suez route, while the New Zealand service (Auckland to London) would be reduced to within 31 days.

It is stated that the current contracts between the British and Australian Governments and the Peninsular and Oriental Company and the Orient Company have been extended for an additional year, and expire in January 1896.

At the Ottawa Conference, to be held in June next, one of the most important subjects for consideration will be whether the time has arrived for Great Britain and the Australasian Colonies to recognise Canada as an Imperial highway for an Australasian mail service, affording the Empire an important alternate route, and I venture to hope that a favourable decision will be arrived at.

At the present moment the only Australian subsidy actually being paid to the Vancouver service is £10,000 sterling per annum by the Government of New South Wales. If that subsidy were increased to at least £50,000 sterling per annum from Australasia, and if the British Government will give the minimum subsidy asked for the Atlantic service of £75,000 sterling per annum, Australasia will secure in 1896 an alternate fortnightly route by way of Canada.

As to the time to be occupied by the mail service between Sydney and London, the promoters of the new company are prepared to name thirty-one days as the period for the first term of years; but, in any event, to do it as quickly as can possibly be done by the Suez route.

It is interesting to note from the Blue-book above referred to that the net cost to New South Wales of its joint service *via* Suez was in 1892 only £13,274 8s. 5*d*. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that the amount collected for stamps would go a long way towards paying the subsidy for the proposed mail service.

As to the possibilities of the proposed line of fast steamers between England and Canada, I can give no higher authority than Mr. Van Horne, the able President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. His thorough investigation of the subject is shown in the following speech made by him at Toronto in January 1893:—

The distance from Quebec to Holyhead is 2,580 miles, and with steamships of the speed of the *Teutonic* or the *City of Paris* the time will be

made in five days and five hours. The time from Holyhead to London is less than six hours, and, allowing an hour for transfer, the time from the wharf at Quebec to Euston Station in London will be made in five days and twelve hours, and only three days and eleven hours will be in the open Atlantic. While the voyage from Sandy Hook to Queenstown is sometimes made in five days and a half, the time from the wharf in New York to the railway station in London is hardly ever made in less than seven days—so seldom that seven days may be taken as the best working result that way. Let two passengers start from London on a Wednesday at 12 o'clock noon, one by the fastest New York steamship, and the other by an equally fast Canadian steamship. The one will reach New York at best at 7 o'clock the following Wednesday morning, local time; the other will have reached Quebec at 7 o'clock Monday evening, local time. The New York passenger may reach Montreal at 7.30 Thursday morning, or Toronto at 10 o'clock Thursday morning. The passenger by the Canadian line will reach Montreal at midnight Monday, or Toronto at 10 o'clock Tuesday morning, two whole days ahead of the New York man. The Canadian passenger will reach Chicago at 11.30 Tuesday night; while the New York man cannot reach there before 9.30 Thursday morning. It is no idle boast that such a Canadian line could take a passenger at London and deliver him in Chicago before the New York line could land him on the wharf in New York. Indeed, we have a margin of ten hours, and the statement might be made to apply to Cincinnati, St. Louis, St. Paul, and Minneapolis. A Boston passenger may reach his home thirty-two hours quicker by the way of Quebec than by the way of New York; and a passenger by the Canadian line will reach New York itself at 7 o'clock Tuesday morning, twenty-four hours ahead of the quickest direct line to New York; and this will be the minimum saving of time to Philadelphia, Washington, and all points in the United States, and as we come northward our advantage becomes greater. In the winter our advantage by the way of Halifax would be ten hours less, but our saving in time would still be great enough to take the business. It is only necessary to provide an attractive service both by land and sea, and to make the railway and steamship services fit together perfectly, to make sure of the business. There are no difficulties of navigation that cannot readily be overcome—a few more lights, a few more fog signals, and a few whistling buoys at the entrance to the Straits of Belle Isle.

But again we are met by the difficulty propounded, apparently in all seriousness, by Sir John Colomb:—

Now let me ask, who is to pay and to be responsible for the protection in war of the new trade line and new submarine cable we are asked to help to establish?

I hope to be able to show him the highest authority for the opinion that the naval strength provided by these fast steamers on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the proposed cable from

Vancouver to Australia, form the strongest claims for Imperial support.

The contract entered into by the Government of Canada with Mr. James Huddart requires the four Atlantic steamships to be capable of steaming 20 knots, under favourable conditions, at sea, and this will involve a trial-trip speed of 21 knots, or equal to 24 statute miles, per hour.

The steamships will be upwards of 10,000 tons register, and will be built in compliance with the usual conditions necessary to secure the subvention for mercantile armed cruisers from the British Admiralty.

The Lords of the Admiralty in 1887, after giving this question the fullest consideration, made the following report to the Treasury, which was adopted and is now in force :—

My Lords would desire to state that the experience derived from the events of 1885 has led them to believe that true economy and real efficiency would be best promoted by securing the use to the Admiralty in times of peace of the fastest and most serviceable mercantile vessels. It will be remembered that in 1885 a sum approximating to £600,000 was expended in retaining the services of several fast merchant steamers, so as to prevent their being available for the service of any Power inimical to the interests of the United Kingdom. Had arrangements existed similar to those now contemplated, their Lordships believe that a very considerable portion of this expenditure would have been averted, and a degree of confidence felt by the nation on which it is very difficult to place a money value.

Their Lordships consider that subventions or annual payments for pre-emption in the use or purchase of these steamers should only be made with those vessels already existing which have an exceptionally high sea-going speed, or for vessels which may be built possessing great speed and adaptable in their construction as armed cruisers.

As to the standard of speed, the Admiralty consider that no vessel or less than 17 or 18 knots at sea would fully meet the object they have in view. They would add further that existing vessels, even with this speed, but which have not been built specially to Admiralty designs, would not be so valuable to the country as vessels which meet these requirements. The trades which can, from a mercantile aspect, support vessels of the type and character that their Lordships desire to see included in the "Reserve Fleet of the Navy" are very limited. Such steamers are only likely to find a profitable mercantile employment in the passenger and mail service, and particularly in the service to America. Vessels constructed to meet the views of the Admiralty would be at a disadvantage in respect to their cargo-carrying powers; and therefore it would be a distinct advantage to the country if every reasonable encouragement were given to shipowners to build and maintain this description of steamer in

the trades that may be expected to support them. The retention of a fleet of "Royal Naval Reserve Cruisers" would be obviously of great national advantage. In a pecuniary sense they would serve to limit the necessity felt by their Lordships for the construction of fast war vessels to protect the commerce of the country. Not only would the nation be a pecuniary gainer in respect to the first cost of such vessels, but their annual maintenance, which amounts to a large sum, would be saved were such vessels maintained whilst not required for Admiralty purposes in mercantile trading.

The Government of Canada applied to her Majesty's Government to join in a subsidy for three steamers for the Pacific service between Vancouver and Hong Kong. This proposal was carefully considered by the Governments of both parties in this country. It was referred to a departmental committee, on which the Colonial Office, Treasury, Post Office, and Army and Navy were represented, with the following results. Lord Granville said in the House of Lords: "It appeared by a minute from his predecessor, Col. F. Stanley (now Earl of Derby), that the late Government had come to the conclusion on principle to approve of this project." And again, on April 29, 1887, Lord Granville said "he had come to the conclusion that it was a most desirable thing from both the naval and military point of view." On June 23 the Right Hon. G. J. Goschen said in the House of Commons that it was "an extremely valuable and important service," and subsequently carried a vote of £45,000 per annum for ten years for these three steamers, which with the £15,000 per annum paid by Canada makes a subsidy of £60,000 a year. I think I am correct in saying that this vote passed *nem. con.* in the House of Commons, of which Sir John Colomb was a member.

The following extracts from a Paper recently placed on record by Gen. Sir A. Clarke, show conclusively the opinions of this high authority on the defence of the Empire.

.

On all grounds, therefore, continuous maintenance of a trade route through the Mediterranean at the outset of war cannot be counted upon. It follows, therefore, that the transport of troops and stores to the East will be equally hazardous, at least for a time.

Of all routes, those of the Atlantic and Pacific will be safest in war with a naval power.

Fast ships on these routes cannot well be captured, except by mere mischance, on the ocean.

No probable enemy, no nation, except the United States, is likely in the immediate future to develop any considerable naval strength in the Pacific; while the maintenance of strong squadrons on the western verge

of the Atlantic will be difficult to any Power not in alliance with the United States.

Again, these ocean routes pass near no naval bases of European Powers, which, especially at the outset of war, will confer on them practical immunity from raids. On the Cape route there is the menace of Dakkar, of Réunion, and possibly of Diego Suarez, which cannot be ignored, and which would unquestionably raise insurance rates to a high figure.

.

An accustomed trade route, regularly used in peace time, will invariably offer inestimable advantages as a communication in war. Along it troops and stores could at once be smoothly conveyed without delays or confusion.

I therefore consider that, from the purely military point of view, any steps taken to develop the ocean route would add greatly to the potential strength of the Empire in war.

.

At such a time the first necessity will be communication between the scattered members of the Empire. Thus only can its vast resources be brought into play; thus only can its existence be assured.

I have preferred to dwell on the military advantages of developing the Western route, and thus providing an alternative line of communication, rather than on the political and economical advantages. The latter must, however, be important and far-reaching.

Politically, the effect will be to bring the members of the Empire into closer union. Economically, the opening up of new avenues of trade will indubitably bring about a wider distribution of products, and reduce the stagnation which is now heavily felt by all classes.

On all these grounds I strongly support the policy urged.

It is for the Imperial Government a primary duty to aid a project by which national advantages in peace time, and security, as well as striking power, in war, will be unquestionably attained.

As to the cable, I may say the following resolution was passed unanimously by the Colonial Conference, called and presided over by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1887, and after the subject had been fully discussed and all the objections urged by those interested in existing routes considered:—

First. That the connection recently formed through Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific by railway and telegraph opens a new alternative line of Imperial communication over the high seas and through British possessions, which promises to be of great value alike in naval, military, commercial, and political aspects.

Second. That the connection of Canada with Australia by direct sub-

marine telegraph across the Pacific is a project of high importance to the Empire, and every doubt as to its practicability should without delay be set at rest by a thorough and exhaustive survey.

The recent visit of the Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, the Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, and Mr. Sandford Fleming, who has given so much attention to the question of a Pacific cable, has excited increased interest in that question in Australasia. It has been followed by a visit to Canada from Sir Thomas McIlwraith from Queensland, and the Hon. Robert Reid from Victoria, and, as already stated, a Conference is to be held at Ottawa on June 21 next. The Australasian Postal and Telegraph Conference, recently held at Wellington in New Zealand, heartily endorsed the proposal for a cable from Vancouver to Australia with the same unanimity that characterised the Intercolonial Conference held at London in 1887. Of course those who have long enjoyed a monopoly may be expected to oppose competition, and I am not surprised at the protest made by those interested parties to her Majesty's Government, and published in the *Times* of April 19, 1894. In that protest the statement of the Wellington Conference, that a guarantee of 4 per cent. for fourteen years would probably induce the company to undertake the work, is treated as an admission that the cable must be renewed at the end of that period. No reason is shown in the article why fourteen years should be determined on as the life of a cable, and it is contrary to the experience of the existing cable companies. Mr. Sandford Fleming took twenty-five years as a basis for calculation; and that this period seems a fair one is shown by the fact that some 5,350 miles (or about 30 per cent.) of the 18,000 miles of cable now forming the system of the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company is more than twenty years old, and is still in working condition, the balance of about 12,650 miles being duplications and extensions laid since 1874. Mr. Sandford Fleming's suggestion that a joint guarantee of 3 per cent. would be sufficient was made on the supposition that the Pacific cable would be undertaken by the Governments concerned, who could obtain money at that rate; not, as would appear from the article, on the assumption that the scheme is to be undertaken by a company—an alternative which he has also dealt with.

The cable companies which control the existing lines between the United Kingdom and Australasia "urge that the existing service was established solely by private enterprise," and without Government aid. These lines, however, had the advantage of being the first lines established, and thus had no opposition to contend with.

The Pacific cable would, however, now have to compete with these very existing lines; which, whatever the case may have been when they were initiated, are now, and for many years past have been, assisted by annual subsidies; a fact not touched upon in the article in the *Times*. Altogether the existing companies which would compete directly or indirectly with the Pacific cable have received in subsidies from various sources up to the present time more than £2,100,000; an amount much in excess of the capital required for a Pacific cable. Of the above amount the Eastern Extension Company alone have received about £643,000, and the African lines, which form an alternative route, £1,337,000.

Then, taking the present traffic between Europe and Australasia to be 1,300,000 words, as given in the *Times* article, and looking on one-half this traffic as going to a Pacific cable, at the sum lately mentioned by Mr. Sandford Fleming—viz. 2s. per word—as the rate for the Pacific cable (after outpayments of 1s. 3d. have been deducted) it would give for the first year's traffic £65,000; but the reduction of the rates from Australasia to Europe (from the present 4s. 9d. per word to 3s. 3d. per word) would naturally bring about a large increase of traffic. Taking this increase as an additional 25 per cent. on the estimated number of words passing over this cable between Australasia and Europe the amount would come to £81,250. As, however, the tariff for the Canadian and American traffic to and from Australia would be cheaper by the Pacific than by the existing routes (by about 1s. per word), this traffic would certainly pass through the Pacific cable. Besides, the traffic from and between the islands at which a Pacific cable touched should be added. Estimating the traffic from these sources at £15,000 for the first year, a total traffic of £96,250 may reasonably be looked for in the first year's working.

Mr. Sandford Fleming states that the normal increase of traffic under the old 9s. 4d. rate between Europe and Australia was 14 per cent. per annum; but taking it only as 12½ per cent., we have for the second year the amount of £108,280, and so on progressively in each succeeding year, as long as the rate of increase of traffic remains the same.

It is therefore obvious that the protest against the proposed cable is largely based upon fallacies. If the reasons urged by those who have so long enjoyed a monopoly should result in her Majesty's Government not giving the assistance required, the competition dreaded would not be prevented but transferred to a company under

the control of a foreign Power, and England will have lost her opportunity.

In conclusion, permit me to say that Australasia and Canada make no "demand" upon the taxpayers of this country, but on the contrary propose to unite with her Majesty's Government in providing an alternative line of steam and cable communication between England and Australasia and Canada, uniting those great possessions of the Crown more closely to each other and to the Mother Country, and furnishing in the best manner possible the means of expanding the trade and strengthening the unity and defence of the Empire.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN : It has always added to the interest of our meetings and never marred their harmony to allow a little discussion as part of the proceedings after the reading of the Paper. I am sure you will agree I ought now to call upon Sir John Colomb, who, I have no doubt, desires to say something about the one brass farthing of which we have heard mention in the Paper.

Sir JOHN COLOMB, K.C.M.G. : I am sure Sir Charles Tupper will allow me in the first place to congratulate him on his Paper. I think I shall be able to remove from his mind the impression that I take up a hostile attitude to the proposed cable and mail routes. I do nothing of the kind. Sir Charles Tupper bases his claim to assistance from the United Kingdom on the great political, strategical, defensive, and commercial advantages and value of his scheme, but he said nothing definitely upon the political and commercial advantages. He has, however, dwelt strongly upon the strategical and defensive value of the proposal, and it is from that point of view, and that only, I wish to speak. My "hostility" is assumed because of my having ventured to ask in the *Times*, who is to pay for the defence of this cable and this mail route in time of war? I have never yet had a definite answer to that question. It is intended, so far as I can see, that the United Kingdom, and the United Kingdom only, shall, in addition to giving a subsidy in time of peace, pay for the defence of the whole line of communication from England to Canada, and from Canada across the Pacific to Australia in case of war. Our assistance is claimed on the ground that this would be an alternative route in time of war. If it is to be an alternative route in time of war, that route must be kept open by force, otherwise it would be no alternative route at all. It

cannot be kept open in time of war except by force. Who is to provide that force? Moreover, this provision must be made in time of peace; we cannot wait till war breaks out. I understand I am told I have no business to ask such a question as who is going to pay for the protection of this route in time of war, because, as I gather, the statement is that Canada has done extraordinary things for the unity and defence of the Empire—that she has almost overburdened herself with taxation to discharge her share in the business of Imperial defence. Well, I am sorry to have to say it, but somebody must say this—that Canada, in proportion to her wealth and her population, pays less for naval and military defence than any other civilised community in the world. (“No.”) Is that denied? Here is what the Governor-General of Canada said at Toronto on January 9 of last year: “There is no civilised country in the world where the burden of naval and military defence falls so lightly as in the Dominion of Canada.” I think that is good enough authority in support of my statement. I am not blaming Canada. I beg everybody here to note that I am for the unity of the Empire, but I say there is a true and a false Imperialism, and I say it is a false Imperialism for our great Colonies to refuse to look their obligations in the face. It means peril and disaster in time of war. The other point I wish to make is this—that if Canada were to join the United States—(“No.”)—I am not saying she ought to do so—I say if she were to join the United States or to become an independent nation, she would have to pay for defence far more heavily than she does now. Now, let us compare the great Dominion with insignificant Switzerland. Switzerland has a population of under three millions; Canada has a population of five millions; Switzerland has a revenue of three and three-quarter millions; Canada has a revenue of seven and a quarter millions; on defence Switzerland pays £1,200,000 a year, while Canada pays only £282,000 a year. Thus Switzerland pays 32 per cent. of her revenue for defence, and Canada does not pay 4 per cent., while the United Kingdom pays 35 per cent. of her revenue for the defence of the Empire. Sir Charles Tupper tells us that in not a single town except Halifax is there a garrison of British troops. I ask, are there not Marine Artillery in British Columbia?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER: They are paid exclusively by Canada.

Sir JOHN COLOMB: Are they not Marine Artillery, British troops, furnished from home?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER: It does not matter where they are furnished from; they are paid exclusively by Canada.

Sir JOHN COLOMB: Very well, but they are British troops; that is a small point. Now I ask, although there are no British troops in Canada, does not Canada rely on having the presence of British troops if required in time of war? Of course she does. ("No.") Then do I understand that England is to abandon the defence of Canada? ("No.") Well, how are you going to do it? It is rather hard to keep to the thread during these interruptions. I pass to the consideration of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I admit that that was a great undertaking, for which Canada deserves every credit. But who is going to defend that line in case Canada is attacked by the United States? ("Canadian troops.") What, 5,000,000 people alone against 60,000,000? Has the gentleman studied war? I say that that railway has added to the military responsibilities of the Empire. It is—unless you are prepared to defend it—a source of weakness rather than of strength, for an invading army getting possession of the line could dominate Canada from one end to the other. I pass on to the canals. They aid in the development of Canada, and are really greatly to her credit, but they cannot be said to add to the general defence of the Empire. Then as to the question of subsidies. I do not think Sir Charles Tupper at all understood the position on this question. He quotes me as having said at a working men's college, "England paid 19s. 6d. out of every pound of the cost of defending the Empire, Australia $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and Canada not a brass farthing." I think he took a very condensed report of what I said at the meeting. What I said then was simply repeating words I used in the House of Commons, and what I said in the House of Commons was, "The House will observe that out of every pound spent for the naval protection of the Empire in 1891-92 the outlying Empire spent $6\frac{1}{2}$ d., and the United Kingdom spent the balance of 19s. $5\frac{1}{2}$ d." I stick to that, and if Sir Charles Tupper does not like me saying that Canada does not pay a brass farthing to maintain the Empire of the sea, I refer him to the official return laid before Parliament annually. I shall have another opportunity of answering Sir Charles Tupper in full. I am for fair and bold discussion. It is not by mutual admiration and fine phrases and grand perorations that this Empire is to be preserved, but by facing the facts, and that I shall continue to do as long as I live, no matter what anyone says. A word as to these proposed subsidies. Two portions of the Empire desire, and rightly desire, to improve their communications, and with that view seek to establish a cable and a mail route. Now these portions of the Empire—Canada and Australasia—have an aggregate population

equal to that of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales all put together. They have a revenue nearly equal to about one-half the total revenue of the United Kingdom, and they have a sea-trade nearly double that of Russia. They come and ask us to find a considerable portion of the money, and base their claim on the ground that the work would contribute to the safety of the Empire in war. Now a cable and a sea-line cannot defend themselves, and I ask, does it show hostility to inquire who is going to pay for the defence? I want a simple answer to the question. I cannot get it. Sir Charles Tupper, in a very friendly spirit, calls my attention to general ideas on the general subject of subsidising mail steamers in peace for service in war. Now this general policy was adopted early in 1887 by the appearance on the Navy estimates of a first sum of 10,000*l.*, and not for any Canadian line. So far from not making any comment on the matter in the House, I raised a debate, although I sat on the Government side, and spoke for an hour against this new policy, which I believed to be fraught with mischief to the Navy and to the Empire. We are asked to subsidise a line of fast mail steamers in order to create a new line. But the reason we subsidise such steamers from our naval estimates is in order to take them off their routes when war breaks out—not to keep them on the lines, but to take them off. The Colonists are relying on having swift communication between them and us in war, but if the steamers are subsidised under this policy, the moment war breaks out they will be taken off. We subsidise them, not to keep them on in war, but to take them off for general service. I see Sir Andrew Clarke shakes his head. I am sorry I get so many shakes of the head, but will he get up and say that it is not so? Sir Charles Tupper knows I am right, and he himself tells us in his Paper that the British Government will have these “steamers available for use anywhere as war cruisers and transports.” That being so, away goes the theory that there will be this alternative route in war. I have not been able to do full justice to this Paper, but I will endeavour to do so at the first opportunity; and in conclusion I will only say that I am glad to come to a point on which I entirely agree with Sir Charles Tupper. Speaking at Winnipeg, he said, “No person holds more strongly than I do the unquestionable duty of every British subject, wherever he may be found, to contribute to the support and defence of this great Empire.” That is my principle, and that is why I ask the question, What are citizens of the Empire going to contribute to the cost of defence? I say that is a question which must be faced. I believe in the unity of the Empire; I believe not in a little

England, but in a great consolidated Empire; and I say the best friends of a consolidated Empire are those who study the broad facts and are not afraid to put them forward. I do not think this Paper contributes at all to that object. The reason I think Canada has not risen to the level of her duty in this matter of defence is that her peaceful progress has been so enormous and so rapid, and her statesmen have directed her development so wisely, that the Canadian people are really beginning to think they will never be exposed to the risk of war. I see nothing in the Paper to recall to the minds of the loyal people of Canada the fact that they have great Imperial duties to perform, and that if they come to us for assistance to establish alternative routes in war they should be prepared to show they have considered the whole matter, and that they realise a responsibility rests upon Canada as well as upon England; a responsibility which it is their duty as well as their highest honour to discharge.

MR. R. R. DOBELL: I wish I had power to do justice to this subject; I shall certainly do my best to vindicate the position Canada has taken up. I lately read a Paper by a well-known writer who has of late years made Canada his home. He says, "Whenever the word 'Empire' is spoken it creates a thrill in every British heart." If to-morrow any of this audience should be suffering from enlargement of the heart, I would recommend him to take a copy of the lecture to his physician in order to help him to diagnose his complaint the more readily. Such a lecture, I believe, does very much to strengthen the bonds between the Colonies and Great Britain. I am glad Sir John Colomb wishes to strengthen those bonds, because the last occasion I heard him speak I thought there must have been many Sir John Colombs when Great Britain lost the Colonies that now form the United States. That was my impression when we attended the deputation to the "Grand Old Man," and when I was obliged to listen, without being able to put in a word in reply, to the speech of Sir John Colomb. If anything in this world could alienate a great Colony like Canada, it would be the thought that anyone deserving of much consideration had delivered such an oration. There are gentlemen here who can bear testimony to the opinion I formed of his address on that occasion. It is very gratifying to come to this country now and to compare this time with fifteen years ago, when I was deputed by the Dominion Board of Trade to form a conference for the purpose of drawing closer the trade relations between Great Britain and her Colonies. We had the greatest difficulty in getting a meeting; there was nobody whom we could

ask to appoint delegates to meet us. Finally, we succeeded in getting a meeting, and there is one gentleman whom I saw at dinner to-night (Mr. Stephen Bourne) who will bear testimony that through that meeting the London Chamber of Commerce began its existence. At that time the Press of this country spoke of Canada with just as much ignorance as Sir John Colomb has shown. I have read articles in the papers of this country reflecting on Canada for putting duties on the manufactures of this country. I remember at that time Sir Alexander Galt, who occupied the high position now held by our lecturer, showed me a telegram he was sending to Ottawa, begging the Government not to put any duties on any foreign country higher than were to be put on British goods. Canada at that time was adopting a national policy, and wished to put lighter duties on British goods than on those of foreign countries. We had a perfect right under the Constitution to do it, and I am sure Sir Charles Tupper will bear me out in that statement. But Great Britain asked us not to interfere with treaty obligations. As the lecturer says, we want those treaty obligations swept away; but, whether or not we have differential duties, there should be no obstacle in the way of closer trade between the Colonies and Great Britain. I have thought on this subject for fifteen years. I believe we are approaching a more intelligent conception of the grand idea of Imperial federation. I am only sorry to see that, owing to some men wishing to ride the one horse of Imperial defence, they have lost sight of the great question of Imperial fiscal trade. That, I believe, will prove to be a great question for this country in the near future. The lecturer in his address told us of the advantages which have attended the confederation of the several provinces of Canada. I am hoping before very long to see a confederation of the Australian provinces, and I believe from that we shall see a confederation of the South African provinces, and then of the West Indies. Then we shall have a strong and compact outside Britain that will compel the attention of the British House of Commons, and put a stop to the ceaseless idle talk that goes on there. You must look to your Colonies to get a little sound sense. I leave for Canada this week, and I carry back with me the very grateful feeling that the people of this country are paying more attention to the Colonies; and, on the other hand, I believe there is a strong appreciation of what this country, in her noble spirit, has done for the Colonies. Never since the world's history began has there been such an example of a country which has expended blood and treasure to establish and strengthen her Colonies and then hand the heirship

of them over to their inhabitants. To Canada, Great Britain handed over the fortresses and Crown lands and all the money she had expended for 100 years, without asking one penny in return; and quite recently she handed over to a mere handful the Colony of Western Australia—a country which may be valued by millions. I would desire to crush and stamp out sentiments such as those expressed by Sir John Colomb about the Colonies not being prepared to do their utmost for the defence of this great Empire. My own impression is that there is not a man in Canada to-day who would not be prepared to spend his life and fortune to maintain the honour and dignity of this great Empire. I question whether Sir John Colomb has ever been to Canada. If not, I make every allowance, and invite him to go there.

SIR JOHN COLOMB: I must explain that I did not say Canada was not prepared to do her share. I said she was not doing it.

THE HON. DUNCAN GILLIES: It struck me, as I read the Paper, that that Paper had been written with a set purpose. You will remember that in 1887 there was in London a Conference representing all the Colonies of the Empire and India. That Conference did a great work. Among the subjects dealt with were the two subjects brought before our notice this evening, and although no absolute decision may have been arrived at concerning them, the Conference did agree as to the importance of the Empire acting together on questions of this kind, and of getting such complete information as would enable such action to be taken. There was no idea of one part of the Empire seeking to gain an undue advantage over the other, and the only thing I would say to the gentleman who spoke against the lecture, Sir John Colomb, is that on that occasion nobody suggested the idea of doing anything other than was just and fair to every part of the Empire. There may be some divergence of opinion as to the vast responsibility which belongs to Great Britain, not as the Empire, but as head of the Empire. An Empire can be nothing without its head, and we look to the House of Commons, the House of Lords, and the Queen, as representing this Empire, to do their duty along with those who are beyond the centre. What was that duty expected to be? The first thing they determined upon was that before taking “a leap in the dark,” before embarking on this great expenditure, we should ascertain what that expenditure would amount to. Now nobody at that time knew what the cost of the cable would be, and with that view an Admiralty survey of a complete character was thought to be necessary. I am not saying that they agreed that the whole of the responsibility

should rest on the Imperial Government, but they did declare that in the interest of the Empire this matter was of sufficient importance to require an exhaustive survey to enable those concerned to determine whether the project was reasonably within their means. That work, so far as I know, has never been completed, and as a matter of fact we do not know, if we took the route suggested, how much the scheme would cost. Here I would say that I sincerely hope the Government will have sufficient firmness and confidence to resist any request improperly and unreasonably made. It has agreed to the Conference at Ottawa, which is to be a Conference of delegates from the various Colonies and from the head of the Empire itself. As I said at the outset, I believe the Paper was read with a clear object, and that object was to tell the story from the author's point of view on the important subjects which are to be raised at that Conference. I am not now going to say whether in my opinion Victoria, New South Wales, and the other Colonies have always subscribed to the full amount for everything that had reference to the welfare of the Empire. It is too large a question, and, besides, it is not the question to-night. The question is, Ought we to have communication under British control from Canada to Australia? Is it desirable in the interests of the whole Empire? If you decide that it is not, you strike at the very root of the project, and we need go no further. If, on the other hand, the question is decided in the affirmative, the question that arises is how much will it cost, who shall be the contributories, and in what proportion ought they, equitably, to contribute. As I understood Sir John Colomb, he struck at the very root of the question. He charges the Colonies with never having contributed their fair proportion. That is not now the question. Let us get rid of side issues and decide the big question, and having done that, then will come the time to ask how much the several Colonies ought, on the merits, to contribute towards what will have been acknowledged to be a national and Imperial work. If it is not Imperial, if you say it is only a matter between Canada and Australia, England will be bound, in the interests of her people, to say, "We cannot help you; we believe it will be a good work, but we do not feel interested in it." Why should not England be interested? Who is to pay for the work? These are questions which will be settled at the Conference. As to the question "Who is to protect the line when laid?" I would ask Sir John Colomb, Who, in the event of war, would protect the existing line? Does he mean to say, Lie quiet and see the line picked up and destroyed? Not for a moment. That is not England's

way, and never was. If a friend of the Empire—a friend of England—one that was an ally—was put to trouble, what would England do? England would act the manly part she always has acted. She would prevent those lines being taken up and destroyed, whomsoever might attempt it. Would the existing company pay for the defence of the present line and prevent its being taken up? Certainly not. What are the navies of Great Britain for? They are for the defence of her people and her honour, and I venture to say it would be a stain upon her honour to allow the humblest of her citizens in any part of the world to be the subject of injustice and outrage, to say nothing of her Colonies, which are bone of her bone. Wherever a project of the nature now under discussion is shown to be ultimately for the great good of the Empire, the Colonies will not be slow to pay their share. In the matter of naval defence, they have not shirked their duty under the arrangement made a few years ago, and I am confident the Imperial Government will not shirk its duty.

Sir LAMBERT DOBSON (Chief Justice of Tasmania): I know there are gentlemen in this room more familiar with this subject than I am. My line is rather judicial than political, and for twenty-five years past my life has been spent in the Supreme Court and not in the political arena. Still, one cannot live so long in a Colony without being inspired with those sentiments which animate the breasts of his fellows. I believe there is not one of us who is not proud to belong to this Empire—that there is not one who does not feel that whatever tends to England's glory is a matter of deepest gratification to us all, and in her hour of trial she enjoys our sympathies. The loss of the *Victoria*, with her noble admiral and crew, was not felt more deeply here than in some of the most remote parts of the Empire, and there was no more sincere expression of sympathy than that which I myself had the honour to transmit from Tasmania. As to the Paper this evening, I do not regret hearing criticism of any suggestion that is made, and I think we really ought to thank Sir John Colomb for his criticism. It may be just or unjust, but by all means let us invite criticism; it is the best means of arriving at the truth. The real question seems to me to be this, would the scheme be of benefit to the British Empire? Now, when we annex a country or take steps to develop a trade, we do not as a rule raise the question as to who, in the case of war, is to defend it. Had we done so, how would the Empire have progressed up to the present moment? We do what we believe to be advisable and advantageous, and when war comes we do our best to maintain what we think

is worth defending. If you think this scheme will produce benefits to the Empire, the scheme itself ought to more than supply the means for its defence. If it be a good thing in itself, let us undertake it, and do not let us be frightened by the possibility of what may arise hereafter in the case of war. Is it beneficial to the Empire at large? If it be beneficial to the Colonies alone, let them carry it out, and let England have strength of mind to say, "It will not benefit us." Still, whatever benefits these Colonies benefits England. Is it the Colonies who manufacture goods, or is it England? And wherever there is a trade route, depend upon it English goods must preponderate and English pockets profit, especially when those goods are directed to countries under the British flag.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir George S. CLARKE, R.E., K.C.M.G.: There is one thing in this interesting Paper which I a little regret. I could wish Sir Charles Tupper had not introduced some of the figures he has given us. All progress in every Colony contributes something to the strength and glory of the Empire; but to express the value of that contribution in £ s. d. is difficult. I could criticise these figures rather severely. They seem, for example, to be put forward as comparable with other expenditure, such, for instance, as the contribution of the Australian Colonies to the Navy, or the expenditure which will fall shortly on the Home Government for the construction of the harbour and dock at Gibraltar. It would, I think, be possible to draw up a column of figures which would put the relative expenditure of the Colonies upon matters of Imperial defence in a very different light. I pass with pleasure to the portion of the Paper in which I thoroughly agree—that is, Sir Charles Tupper's advocacy of the completion of the link across the world between England to Australia, going west. I do not think an Imperial subsidy could be better applied than in encouraging such a project, and I thoroughly endorse all that has been quoted on that head from Sir Andrew Clarke. As to Sir John Colomb's criticisms, I do not agree with him. I cannot see how the increased burden is to arise. The twenty-knot steamers which are to be provided will be very well able to take care of themselves if they are used for commerce. If they are used for war, *calit quæstio*—they have not to be defended. As to the cables, I do not think they will require any special protection. It all turns on the naval policy this country is to pursue—whether that policy is to be vigorous offensive, searching out an enemy's vessels wherever they may be, or a miserable defensive, waiting for an enemy's attack. There is one

great and distinctively national force which alone can keep the Empire together and protect the commerce upon which the Colonies, as well as the Mother Country, depend for existence. I hope that the time will come when every Colony of whatever degree will contribute something to the national navy.

Mr. GEORGE R. PARKIN : It will be found, I think, that I occupy a sort of middle position between what I may almost call the combatants of this evening. One speaker has remarked that, when the American Colonies revolted, there were probably many Sir John Colombs in this country. Now, I would remind you that the statesmen of this country had a perfect right to ask at that time whether the American Colonies should or should not pay something towards the expense of the great expeditions by which Britain saved them from the greatest perils. The most brilliant of American historians, Parkman, admits that, by crushing the French power in America, Britain even furnished the United States with the very conditions of their existence. It was not the fact of asking, but the time and more especially the manner of asking, which was open to objection. The figures which Sir Charles Tupper has presented to-night, showing the large sums which Canada has spent on internal development, are certainly some of the most remarkable that could be given from the history of any young country. Now, why has the Dominion been able to spend these immense sums in the directions indicated, instead of giving a larger part of it to military and naval defence? Because, in the good course of Providence, she, like other British Colonies, was under the protection of the mightiest Power that ever held a shield over a people, and which practically said, "You need not spend your money in preparing to fight; we leave you free to develop your enormous resources." Not only has England put her shield over us, but she has given us the mighty backing of her credit. But a new time has arrived, and the question which Sir John Colomb has asked must be answered as time goes on. We have developed our commerce and our internal resources to an enormous degree. Incidentally, we have been doing our best to build up the Empire. But the time must come when every Canadian must ask, "How is our flag and our extending commerce protected?" The question I have asked is, "Do you pretend that we are to take part in the defence of the Empire and pay for the Army and Navy?" and in almost every large Canadian town I have declared I would be ashamed of the name of Canadian if we were not willing to take the responsibility of our increasing growth. The only question that lies between Sir

Charles Tupper and Sir John Colomb is whether the time has arrived when it is right and just we should change from this indirect expenditure, by which Canada has enormously strengthened the Empire in the past, to the time when we should take on our shoulders a more broad and national burden. Take the States of South America and other small countries. They have spent much of their large loans in building up armies and navies. The British Colonies alone are able to spend their resources in building up the strength of the Empire by a course of internal development. The question I have already asked must come some day. Now I come to this point, that Sir John Colomb is wrong at this moment on the facts which have been referred to. We are discussing whether this country shall make a contribution for great Imperial lines of telegraphic and mail communication between Australia and Canada. The drift of Sir John Colomb's argument is that Canada and Australia merely want to unite in trade, and that they therefore ought to take a full share, not only of the contribution to this scheme, but for its defence, and that Great Britain has not such an interest as that she should be asked to do that for the support of Australia and Canada. Now, I claim that this country has an overwhelming interest beyond either Canada or Australia in the construction of that line. Canada and Australia do not at present probably spend a thousand a year in telegraphing between each other, and the trade is purely prospective; while, on the other hand, Great Britain, which spends hundreds of thousands a year for that purpose, will at once get the advantage of cheaper rates, and will have the further advantage of commanding commerce in a way she never did before. Hitherto, again, the question of who shall bear the expense of defending the Empire has been met at the extremities in this way. They say England could not exist unless she kept these lines safe; her life depends upon it, and she must in any case defend them. But in her own interest, now, a new question has arisen, and it gives some little justification for Sir John Colomb's question. For the first time, two great Colonies form a line of trade communication between themselves, independent of English commerce, and Sir John Colomb's question has therefore more meaning than it could ever have had before, though I do not think he has gone to work quite in the right way. I think it is Sir George Clarke who has shown that by means of a Pacific cable the commerce of this country and the Empire generally will have a security such as it never enjoyed before, since it can be directed along varying routes in time of war, and that is very true if the Admiralty have the brains to work out the plans for using it. I

claim that, from that point of view, this country has a great interest, and would be justified in making large sacrifices for the scheme. My own opinion is that, if this country refuses to help, the Colonies will do the work for themselves. But if you lift the question into a higher sphere, and ask how we are going to secure the unity of the Empire, I think we must, sooner or later, face Sir John Colomb's question; but we must go about it with a tact and consideration which will test the statesmanship of the best men in this Empire. I hold that the very fact of getting Australia and Canada to join in building that line would establish for them such important interests across one of the great oceans of the world that the argument would be greater than ever before for saying to them, "You have a right to bear part in the naval defence of the Empire." I am not now speaking of military defence, though on that point I would say that the resisting power of the Canadian people is more than a match for any probable enemy on their own continent. In conclusion, I would say that, in my opinion, this scheme, if carried at Ottawa, will mark an immense step in the direction of the unity of the Empire. Every man ought to do his best to accomplish that object, and then, I think, Sir John Colomb's question may be asked in a way that will not awaken suspicion by an appeal to the strength and growing influence of these great self-governing communities.

The Hon. R. E. O'CONNOR (M.L.C., New South Wales) : I do not think there was anything in the remarks of Sir John Colomb which need have roused the tempest they appear to have roused in the minds of some. What he did say was open to answer, and has been very well answered. The importance to England and to the Colonies of this new route of cable and mail communication seems to me invaluable from one point of view, if from no other, and that is, that you would thereby secure a route which in all probability would never be troubled with the shadow of war. Any of the routes at present in use would, in the event of a European war or war in India, be blocked. The total stoppage of communication between England and her Colonies in time of war would involve consequences, commercial and social, that are hard to realise. Taking all human probabilities into account, is it likely that at any time the proposed route would be the seat of war, unless you can suppose, which is almost impossible, that America and Canada should ever wish to fly at each other's throats? In regard to the liability of the cable or mail route to attack in a maritime war, let me remind you that Great Britain and the Colonies, from motives of common interest, apart altogether from the sentiment of the unity

of the Empire, have thought fit to arrange for a navy for the defence of their commerce. It is of great importance to the Colonies that commerce should be kept free ; it is of almost equal importance to England. Both parties, then, have arranged for the naval defence of the Colonies, so that the routes shall be kept open by men-of-war, each party paying a share. The principle, then, of the protection of these routes has already been settled. Once concede it is to the advantage of Great Britain and the Colonies that trade should follow a particular route, and it will be conceded some means must be found to protect that route. I have sincere pleasure in being present this evening and seeing for myself one of the admirable advantages of this Institute. After all, questions like those dealt with in Sir Charles Tupper's admirable Paper are questions above all others which are settled by public discussion. The first step towards obtaining a verdict before the bar of public opinion is full and correct information, and that has been the mark of the Paper this evening. As a contribution to the information of the public and the Press, and as a guide to those who are to take part in the discussions at Ottawa, I think the Paper has admirably served its purpose.

The Rev. D. V. LUCAS, D.D. : It has been asked who, in case of war, would defend the ports and forts along our coast. Well, with respect to loyalty and readiness to sacrifice on the part of Canadians, perhaps you will allow me to indulge in a little bit of family history. My people have dwelt in Canada for 125 years. When my great-ancestor saw the old flag trailing in the dirt at Boston, he moved north to Canada, so as to keep under the old flag. When, whether rightly or wrongly, Great Britain saw fit, in order to take runaway soldiers or sailors, to search American ships, a war broke out. Canada had no more to do with the war than the man in the moon, except that she was a British Colony. All my grandfather's family took part in the defence of British interests on Canadian soil. When, again, we had a rebellion in 1837-38, my father shouldered his musket and left his family in the woods, to go out and defend the British flag. When we were attacked by the Fenians, not many years ago, Canada had nothing to do with the quarrel between England and Ireland. But in 1812-14, in 1837-38, and again during the Fenian raids, some Canadian women were left without husbands and children without fathers. I do not know that these widows or children were ever compensated, or that England footed the bill ; but I do know that Canadians were ready to defend British interests on Canadian soil, in wars with which they had really nothing to do. When I remember these things, and when I

think also of the loyalty of the people at the Antipodes—for I have travelled among them—I say that, should the occasion arise, you will find hundreds of thousands of able-bodied men, sons of your own neighbours, and sons of the men who have dwelt there for years, who are ready not only to furnish the money, but to lay down their lives in defence of the greatest Empire the world has seen.

The CHAIRMAN: After his great kindness in reading the Paper, I feel we ought not to keep the High Commissioner much longer. In regard to these discussions, I always feel we ought rather to take one step at a time than to make very long programmes; and although there has perhaps been a great deal too much canting talk in politics about trusting the people, I do think we can trust to people's judgment from the experience of the past, and that we may confidently conclude that each Colony will do her part when the time of danger comes. In regard to the preparation for that danger, I think the same remark applies—that we can only hope and expect the Colonies will take one step at a time. Remember, we in this small territory have done almost all the public works that are to be done, except the making of a maritime canal to Birmingham; while they, on their part, have gigantic territories still to be developed, and the amount of legitimate pressure for developing necessary public works beats anything we know of. Therefore we must make allowances for that, and not expect them to do too much at any one time, considering also the small space of time that has elapsed since they have been more or less thrown on their own resources. For instance, when it became known that the policy of Great Britain was to withdraw the Imperial troops from Canada and elsewhere, there was no official remonstrance from the Canadian Government, although there was no doubt a good deal of private regret. That meant that they intended to have in time an efficient native army of their own. In the few years which have elapsed since then, we have seen Australia put her hand into her pocket for naval, and to some extent for land, defence. Canada has a most valuable institution for the training of officers, and I hope a great deal of her money devoted to military purposes will be spent on the adequate and thorough training of non-commissioned officers. One step at a time we must expect, and I do not think we ought to expect much more. The same thing applies, in my opinion at least, in regard to such questions as Imperial federation. I think the making of extensive programmes, and looking too far ahead, and gigantic theories, all a mistake. I believe we ought to take in hand

those questions which are being pushed by the authority of the Governments of the day. You have such a question in the matter of cable and mail communication between Canada and Australia. I believe Great Britain will find it greatly to her advantage to further that end, and I hope all those who may have belonged to the now defunct Imperial Federation League will give a hand to the cause. I propose that we give a hearty vote of thanks to Sir Charles Tupper for his able and interesting lecture.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER : I have no intention of trespassing at any length on your kind indulgence. In the first place, I desire to say how gratified I was to learn that I should have the honour of addressing Lord Lorne as Chairman on this occasion, for I know that no person understands better the country of which in particular I was speaking, and I know also that there is no one who enters more heartily and more fully into all questions concerning the unity and greatness of our Empire. All Canadians, without respect of party, look upon the period when they had the good fortune of having your Lordship as Governor-General with the greatest possible pleasure, and they are grateful, not only for your good services then, but for the fact that, from that time to the present, you have never failed to avail yourself of every means of advancing the interests of Canada. I do not intend to enter into any elaborate criticism of the arguments advanced by my friend Sir John Colomb, but I must at once put him right on a most important point. It is this ; when I referred to the services Canada has rendered to the unity and strength of the Empire by various measures taken since the confederation, I mentioned them not as a full discharge of the obligations of Canada to the Empire, but as an earnest and as the best possible evidence of what she would be prepared to do in the future. Sir John Colomb was quite accurate in his quotation from my speech at Winnipeg, but I confess I cannot quite understand the manner in which he has dealt with my proposition. I am sure I express the judgment of every candid person when I say he has greatly underrated what Canada has done. When forty millions of people in the United States carried out the transcontinental line of railway, they were held up to the civilised world as having accomplished a most gigantic undertaking. Now, five millions of people in Canada have, in a much shorter time, accomplished an even greater work ; and I am bold to say that there is not a naval or military authority in this country who will not say that that work is a most valuable contribution to the strength and unity of the Empire. Can any man who thinks upon the question say

that a line of railway communication that stretches from ocean to ocean and forms an alternative highway to India, upon which England may have to depend to-morrow for the retention of her possessions in the East, is not a most valuable contribution to the strength and unity of the Empire? When you reflect on the position of this country in the case of a European war, and in the event of the Suez Canal being blocked, I do not think there is any fair-minded man who will not say that an alternative highway to India, by which Vancouver may be used as a *place d'armes* and troops placed as near the striking-point as they are by the Suez Canal, is a most valuable contribution to the defence of the Empire. I do not underrate the fact that this great transcontinental railway and our system of canals—surpassing any inland navigation the world can produce—are not means of opening up and developing Canada; but if Sir John Colomb's view is to be accepted, there must be an entire abandonment of anything like railway or canal or similar enterprise. I am glad to be able to think that the last contingency that England has to fear is so unnatural a thing as war with the great republic of America. Only this last year the two countries gave a great object-lesson to the civilised world when they agreed to refer to an international tribunal a most crucial and exciting controversy. They have given us the best possible evidence that we need not anticipate anything so terrible as a conflict between these two great English-speaking peoples; but, putting that aside, I say, as regards our possessions in the East, that line of railway communication is of the utmost value. Here is a country which, as Lord Dufferin declared, is capable of providing happy homes for forty millions of people. What was the position of that country before the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway? It was a vast desert, shut off from the Pacific Ocean and British Columbia by the Rocky Mountains. It was the home of twenty-five thousand savages and wild animals. What has been effected by this railway? It has been made into the future granary of the world, capable of furnishing all the grain and meat supplies this country demands, at the same time creating a market for the exports of England, and adding to her strength as an Empire. But I pass on. Sir John Colomb has made the question of the Navy his great and vital question. I say we are providing a navy. What do the Lords of the Admiralty call these steamships for which I am pleading? "The Royal Naval Reserve Cruisers." I refer Sir John Colomb to the quotations I gave on that point. I thought I was going to make a convert of him. I know I ought to

do, for, as supporting the policy I advocate, I cited the authority of the highest naval and military experts and the statesmen of both parties, and that policy they declared to be the best for the naval defence of the Empire. I fail to understand what ground my friend can take for still maintaining hostility to the plan, unless he asks us to believe he is a greater authority than all the leading statesmen and all the naval and military authorities. Sir John Colomb says that when these lines of steamers are wanted they won't be there. Where will they be? They will be doing yeoman service for England; they will be available for the sending of troops and munitions of war, and of communicating with any portion of the Empire. This, further, I will tell Sir John Colomb—and I am not speaking without the book—one of the first services for which this line of steamers will be available in case of war is the carrying of volunteers from Australia and Canada to fight the battle of England and to maintain British institutions. I apologise for having spoken so long, and in conclusion I move a vote of thanks to our Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN having responded, the proceedings terminated.

EIGHTH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

THE Eighth Ordinary General Meeting of the Session was held at the Whitehall Rooms, Hôtel Métropole, on Tuesday, June 19, 1894, when The Right Rev. Bishop Selwyn, D.D., read a Paper on "The Islands of the Western Pacific."

Sir Robert G. W. Herbert, G.C.B., a Member of the Council of the Institute, presided.

The Minutes of the last Ordinary General Meeting were read and confirmed, and it was announced that since that Meeting 31 Fellows had been elected, viz., 8 Resident and 23 Non-Resident.

Resident Fellows :—

William S. Caine, M.P., Walter Church, John A. Douglas, Joseph J. Elliott, Samuel R. Kearne, David R. Kemp, Charles S. C. Watkins, Thomas Lett Wood.

Non-Resident Fellows :—

Ex-Sultan Abdullah of Perak, George W. Alexander, M.P.P. (British Columbia), Dr. P. T. Carpenter (British Honduras), A. C. D'Estree (Victoria), W. C. L. Dyett (Trinidad), Dr. Eakin (Government Medical Officer, Trinidad), Captain Gustav A. Ettling (Cape Colony), H. Montague Faithfull (New South Wales), Desiré Girouard, Q.C., M.P. (Canada), Rt. Hon. Sir George Grey, K.C.B. (New Zealand), Graham A. Haygarth (Queensland), Alfred Jones (British North Borneo), George E. Lewis (Victoria), Gabriel Lincoln (Mauritius), Rev. D. V. Lucas, D.D. (Canada), Major Sir Claude M. MacDonald, K.C.M.G. (H.B.M.'s Commissioner and Consul-General for the Niger Coast), James B. McIvor (Cape Colony), H. C. Moore (Mashonaland), Robert Nisbet (Transvaal), Edward Rooth (Transvaal), Hon. John C. Schultz, M.D. (Canada), Hon. J. Malbon Thompson (New South Wales), H. C. Arthur Young (Queensland).

It was also announced that donations to the Library of books, maps, &c., had been received from the various Governments of the Colonies and India, Societies, and public bodies both in the United Kingdom and the Colonies, and from Fellows of the Institute and others.

The CHAIRMAN: This being the last meeting of the session, it may interest you if, before we proceed to the special business of the evening, I give you a brief recapitulation of the business that has been done during the past year, with which I have been favoured by our Secretary. We have had a rather notable series of papers—papers of great ability and importance. We had a paper by Lord Onslow on New Zealand, papers by Mr. Selous and Mr. Colquhoun

